



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/005,898	11/02/2001	Maurice Haman Abraham	B-4358 619258-8	7200

7590 07/13/2005
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
P. O. BOX 272400
3404 E. Harmony Road
Intellectual Property Administration
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

ENGLAND, DAVID E

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2143

DATE MAILED: 07/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/005,898

Applicant(s)

ABRAHAM ET AL.

Examiner.

David E. England

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 April 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 9 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1 – 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Jawahar et al.
U.S. Patent No. 6298356 (hereinafter Jawahar).

4. Referencing claim 1, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Jawahar teaches a computer apparatus for implementing a workflow, the workflow being defined by a sequence of activity nodes that include a plurality of interactive nodes, the computer apparatus comprising a processor for arranging and initiating the execution of the activity nodes in accordance with the defined sequence, wherein each interactive node is arranged to allow a user to input data for use in the execution of an activity node, the processor being arranged to analyze the user data to determine the interactive node in the sequence of activity nodes to which the data is associated, (e.g. col. 13, lines 10 – 28 & col. 16, lines 23 – 39).

Art Unit: 2143

5. Referencing claim 2, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Jawahar teaches the processor, being arranged, in response to the analyze, to initiate execution of the associated interactive node such that if the user data is associated with an interactive node that has been executed the interactive node is re-executed, (e.g. col. 13, lines 10 – 28 & col. 21, lines 35 – 44).
6. Referencing claim 3, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Jawahar teaches the processor is arranged to compensate executed activity nodes that follow in the defined sequence from the re-executed interactive node, (e.g. col. 13, lines 10 – 28 & col. 14, lines 40 – 55, *“back and forward”*).
7. Referencing claim 4, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Jawahar teaches a computer system comprising a computer apparatus according to claim 1 coupled, via a network, to a second computer apparatus, the second computer apparatus having a user interface to allow a user to input data for an interactive node, (e.g. col. 13, lines 10 – 28 & col. 14, lines 40 – 55, *“back and forward”*).
8. Referencing claim 5, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Jawahar teaches the network is the internet, (e.g. col. 13, lines 10 – 28).
9. Referencing claim 6, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Jawahar teaches the user interface is an internet application allowing sequential movement between web pages, (e.g. col. 13, lines 10 – 28 & col. 14, lines 40 – 55, *“back and forward”*).

10. Claims 7 – 9 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments filed 04/14/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

12. In the Remarks, Applicant argues in substance that the Examiner has failed to clearly show whether “the computer apparatus for implementing a workflow” in Jawahar is the customer’s computer or the agent’s computer. Furthermore, Applicants submit that the Examiner has failed to show where it is disclosed or suggested in Jawahar that the user’s computer is provided for arranging and initiating the execution of activity nodes in accordance with a defined sequence, and more particularly that the user’s computer comprises a “processor for arranging and initiating the execution of the activity nodes in accordance with the defined sequence”.

13. As to part 1, Examiner would like to first state that the agent’s computer is utilized as the computer apparatus for implementing a workflow. As to the user’s computer is provided for arranging and initiating the execution of activity nodes in accordance with a defined sequence, and more particularly that the user’s computer comprises a “processor for arranging and initiating the execution of the activity nodes in accordance with the defined sequence” the Examiner will refer to the statement above in which it is the agent’s computer that is to be interpreted as the computer apparatus for implementing a workflow. This also applies to claim 7.

14. In the Remarks, Applicant argues in substance that claims 2 – 6 and 8 – 9 are patentable at least in view of their dependency on claims 1 or 7.

15. As to part 2, Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

Conclusion

16. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David E. England whose telephone number is 571-272-3912. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur, 7:00-5:00.


Art Unit: 2143

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on 571-272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David E. England
Examiner
Art Unit 2143

De



DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100